

19. King Gopí Chand considereth in his heart, the words of my mother have come true. He draweth from his waistband knives and daggers, and putteth them to his throat. But God above seized and stopped him, saying, 'Why, O my ascetic, dost thou kill thyself. There is ambrosia in thy finger.' So he split his finger and gave his sister (ambrosia) to drink (and she came to life again). Then the ascetic went off on his wanderings.

19. (Saith Gopí Chand to himself), 'Let me strike myself with knife and dagger, and let the brother die in the place of his sister.' Then up came Náráyana in the form of a Bráhman, and caught hold of him, crying, 'Ho, sinful one, in thy little finger is ambrosia. Give it to thy sister to drink; and thy dead sister will come to life; and do thou take the form of a bee, and go away and be an ascetic.' (*Here the sister is supposed to come to life, and Gopí Chand to go away.*)

20. His sister arose and sat up. Through every lane she wept. She caught the sandal tree and wept; and the sandal tree replied, 'Why dost thou weep? Thy brother hath become an ascetic.' Then cried the sister, 'woe is me', and the earth opened and she entered into it (and was swallowed up by it). And thus was broken the relationship of brother and sister between these two.

On some more Copper Coins of Akbar.—By CHAS. J. RODGERS, *Principal, Normal College, Amritsar.*

(With a Plate.)

When in 1881 I wrote a paper on the Copper Coins of Akbar, it was with much diffidence that I put forward any views of my own. Those views were in fact only deductions from the coins I had before me. Mr. Thomas in a short but friendly paper opposed my deductions. He corrected the reading of one coin from *dám* to *damrá*. I need not say that I knew the inscription would bear this interpretation. I had, however, never seen this word in any books on Indian coins, not even in Mr. Thomas's most exhaustive treatises. I quite agree with him that a *damrá* may be two *damrís*. I was attacked somewhat personally by an anonymous writer in the *Pioneer* who evidently had not been guilty of such patient research as myself. He said Akbar never struck coins bearing the word *tánke*. A look at my plates must have upset his unfounded assertion.

I have, however, to plead guilty of making another mistake. I read a word on several coins as *sikka*. This word, General Cunningham has

kindly pointed out to me, should be *tankah*. I quite agree with this correction and am very thankful to the General for the kind manner in which he brought it to my notice. One other reading was also corrected. Here my coin was in fault. I read it *Zarb-i-Illahábás*. On the plainest coins it is certainly *Muhr-i-Illahábás*. It is seldom perhaps so many mistakes are made in one paper. I can only plead the fact that I was busy in making preparations for my furlough and that I had not time to consult my more learned and experienced fellow-numismatists. None, however, of my critics give me credit for introducing to notice so many novelties. A careless perusal of my short paper will show that I proved the *fulús* to be a coin of uncertain weight, that I gave a *yak tánke*, a *do tánke*, a *damrá*, a *damrí* and several *tankahs* besides the coins of several mints up to that time unpublished and of several up to that time unknown. This I mention to show that my paper was not without some value in spite of its faults. Since 1881, I have kept up my researches and am able now to give a new series of coins which I shall leave to speak for themselves.

The coins I have drawn are all of pure copper. Some are very thick as will be seen from the plate where the two lines under the coins indicate their thickness. The weight of each is given under it in grains.

They are as follows (see Plate I) :—

(1.)	<i>Obv.</i>	ضرب بيدرات تنكه اكبر شاهي	<i>Rev.</i>	اردي بهشت ۴۵ الهی
(2.)	<i>Obv.</i>	Ditto	<i>Rev.</i>	اسفندار ۴۴ الهی
(3.)	<i>Obv.</i>	ضرب بيدراته نیم تنكه اكبر شاهي	<i>Rev.</i>	خور داد ۴۴ الهی
(4.)	<i>Obv.</i>	Ditto	<i>Rev.</i>	صاه تیر ۴۴ الهی
(5.)	<i>Obv.</i>	چهارم حصه تنكه اكبر شاهي	<i>Rev.</i>	ضرب آگره اسفندار ۴۵ الهی
(6.)	<i>Obv.</i>	هشتم حصه تنكه اكبر شاهي	<i>Rev.</i>	صاه ابان ۴۶ الهی
(7.)	<i>Obv.</i>	دهم حصه تنكه اكبر شاهي		
		ضرب دهلي شانز	<i>Rev.</i>	صاه فروردین ۴۲ الهی
(8.)	<i>Obv.</i>	ditto (without mint)	<i>Rev.</i>	صاه تیر ۴۴ الهی
(9.)	<i>Obv.</i>	same as (7)	<i>Rev.</i>	صاه مهر ۴۶ الهی
(10.)	<i>Obv.</i>	نصفي	<i>Rev.</i>	geometrical figures.
(11.)	<i>Obv.</i>	نصفي	<i>Rev.</i>	ditto.
(12.)	<i>Obv.</i>	ضرب — تنكه اكبر شاهي	<i>Rev.</i>	خور داد ۴۴ الهی
(13.)	<i>Obv.</i>	مهر الها باس	<i>Rev.</i>	سنه ۳۱ الهی
(14.)	<i>Obv.</i>	يك تنكه اكبر شاهي	<i>Rev.</i>	ضرب كابل اسفندار ۴۶ الهی

Of these coins Nos. 1, 2, 12 are the property of my venerable and kind friend General Cunningham, No. 11 is from an impression by the same gentleman at Lucknow in 1840, and given to me some years back.

No. 3 is the property of Dav. Ross, Esq., C. I. E., M. R. A. S., &c. Traffic Manager Sind, Panjab and Delhi Railway. No. 14 belongs to L. White King, Esq., C. S., a most indefatigable numismatist. The remainder are from my own poor cabinet.

By comparing this list of coins with that published in my former paper, it will be seen that of Akbar's Copper Coins we have, now, knowledge of the following :—

		weights in grains.
The one <i>tánke</i>	يك تانكے	59
The two <i>tánke</i>	دو تانكے	108, 109.
The one <i>tanke</i>	يك تنكے	58·8.
The <i>damrí</i>	دمری	40.
The <i>damrá</i>	دمرا	76.
The <i>fulús</i>	فلوس	326, 149, 38, 37.
The <i>mohur</i>	مہر	316.
The <i>tankah</i>	تنگہ اکبر شاہی	618, 620, 623·4, 626.
The half <i>tankah</i>	نیم تنكے	317·5, 309.
The fourth part of the <i>tankah</i>	چہارم حصہ تنكے	153·1.
The eighth part ditto	ہشتم حصہ تنكے	39·5.
The sixteenth part ditto	شانزدہم حصہ تنكے	37·5, 38·5.
The <i>nisfe</i>	نصفے	154·5.

I know of only one one-*tánke* piece and of only one one-*tanke* piece both of which are given in my papers, and neither of which belongs to me. I have seen only one *nisfe* and one-fourth part of a *tankah* and one eighth part. Sixteenth parts are common. I have about a dozen of them. The *tankah* is as rare as it is large. The halves are still rarer. The two given in my paper are the only ones I have yet seen. The cabinets of other numismatists and of museums may contain others. Of the *mohur* one specimen is published by the Honorable Syud Ahmad, C. S. I., in his edition of the *Aín-i-Akbarí*. But in a conversation I had the other day with him, he disputed this reading, and was inclined to my former reading *zarb*.

I am not going to bring forward any views of my own on this occasion, or make any deductions from the coins. I will simply quote a letter sent me by General Cunningham, after we had discovered the *tankah* and its parts, and thus fixed the weight of this coin.

Simla, 5th July, 1883.

My dear Rodgers,

Ever since we got the Tanka of Akbar *fixed* I have been thinking of Akbar's revenues, and at last I *think* that I see some light.

Thomas began his reasoning with an assumption that “there can be very little contest about the value of Nizám-ud-Dín’s pieces designated as Tankah-i-Murádí.” He takes them to be the same as the old Sikandarí tanka of twenty to the rupee (p. 7, Akbar’s Revenues) which is certainly wrong. He *assumes* that they were so; but gives no proofs, nor even any arguments.

Now let us examine the facts:—

De Laët gives Akbar’s revenue on Jahángir’s accession in two forms: thus:—

VI. Arab et 98 caror Dám.
or III. Arab et 49 caror *Tangarum*.

Now here is a new proof of 1 Tanga = 2 Dáms.

	Arabs kross tákhs.				
Abul Fazl’s collected amounts come to	...	5,	67,	63	83, 383 dáms.
Nizám-ud-Dín’s statement	...	6,	40,	00	00, 000 murádí tan- kas.
De Laët’s statement	...	6,	98,	00	00, 000 dáms.

Put in this way it seems clear to me that Nizám-ud-Dín’s *murádí tankas*, are the common dáms of Akbar. I do not understand the name of *Murádí*, but I think it possible that there may be a mistake in this name; and for the following reason:—

I have two copper coins of Akbar, like your No. 15,—but both of them used *مهر* *muhr* instead of *zarb*. *Muhr-i-Ilahábás*, the stamp or coin of *Ilahábás*. (See No. 13 of my present plate, which I have drawn from a perfect coin of my own two, illustrate this portion of General Cunningham’s letter.) The name of the coins would then become *مهرآوی* *Muhráwí*, and hence I take them to be the real pieces intended by the corrupt name of *Murádí*. Can you refer to any MS. of the *Tabaqát-i-Akbarí*?

Had Nizám-ud-dín intended the *tankas* of Akbar, there was no necessity for calling them by any other name than simply *tankas*, as written on the coins themselves. But as *dám* was a new name, introduced by Akbar himself, it seems highly probable that the coins of the same weight as Akbar’s *dáms* were previously known as *tankas* with some qualifying title. (In fact Sher Sháh’s 320 grain coins were called *tánkas*.)

(By the way my two heavy (640 grain) tankahs of Akbar are not from your Dehli mint but from Bairát, as I read the name—I will of course send them to you.)

Now as to Akbar’s revenue. Turn to Thomas, p. 52 and add up Sháh Jahán’s revenues from the same provinces as Akbar held. The

total is 18 krors + 50 lacs of rupees. Now compare the progressive revenues in krors and lakhs of rupees.

	Krors lakhs.
Akbar { Abul Fazl	14, 97
{ Nizám-ud-Dín	16, 00
{ De Laët	17, 45
{ Sháh Jahán	18, 50
Same provinces	
Sháh Jahán later	22, 00
Aurangzeb	26, 74
Ditto	35, 64
Ditto	38, 62
Ditto	30, 17 after loss of provinces.

Now these figures of progressive revenue show incontestably that Akbar's revenue could not have been more than 16 krors,—and the double statement of De Laet, in *tankas* and *dáms*, is specially clear and serves to fix the value of Nizám-ud-Dín's *Murádí tankas* as simple *Akbarí dáms*.

I am,

very sincerely yours,

A. Cunningham.

I, on my own part, would only draw attention to the fact that these *tankahs* of Akbar, and the different parts of the same coin, seem to have been all struck in the last ten years of his reign, between 40 and 50 *Iláhí*. The weight of the *نصف* seems to make it as a *half dām*. At the same time I must say I have never yet seen a coin with the name *dām* on it. The Honorable Syud Ahmad told me he had seen one.

From the weights given above, it would seem that the *tankah* weighed about 640 grs. The half 320, the quarter 160, the eighth part 80, the sixteenth part 40. Against this, however, we have the weights of two coins published in my former paper Nos. 18 and 19 of Gobindpúr and Dogám which are called *tankahs* and weigh 327 and 319 grains. The *Bairát** *tankahs* and *half tankahs*, the *Agra quarter* and the *Delhí*

* For interesting facts regarding *Bairát*, see the Reports of the Archæological Survey of India, Vol. II, pp. 342-6, and Vol. VI, pp. 91-103. It was famous for its copper mines. I am ignorant of the position of *Dogám*. There are several *Gobindpurs*. We want sadly a *Historical Geography of the Muhammadan period*. Conquerors changed the names of places. The names remained for a time and were allowed then to fall into disuse. Thus *Adúní* was called by Aurangzeb *Imtiyázgurh*. Rupees were struck bearing this latter name. I have seen several though I possess none. I should like to know where *Alamgípur* is, and a lot of other places.

sixteenth parts, however, show that in other parts of the empire there was one acknowledged standard weight for the *tankah*.

I do not intend this paper as an answer to the kind papers of Mr. Thomas and Mr. Keene. It is rather an apology for my former paper and its mistakes, and is intended as an additional contribution to our knowledge of Akbar's copper coinage. I do not know the date of the completion of the *Aín-i-Akbarí*, but in it a very incomplete account is given of Akbar's copper coinage. Our cabinets, however, provide us with coins of the whole reign from the 963 year coins of Nárnol to the 50th Iláhi year coins of Ágra. It remains for historians and revenue officers to discuss the matter in the light these new coins give.

I may add that the *Aín Akbarí* gives many subdivisions of the rupee of Akbar, and that as my cabinet contains specimens of each piece, I shall, if I can find time, give a plate of these subdivisions.

P. S. Since the above was in press I have visited Ágra, Muttra and Delhí and have obtained two Ágra *tankahs*; several *ním tankaks*, one of Ágra; two *chhárum hissa i tankahs*, and one Kábul *do tanke* piece. All these tend to confirm what I have advanced in this paper.

Some Coins of Ranjít Deo, king of Jummú a hundred years ago.—By
CHAS. J. RODGERS, *Principal, Normal College, Amritsar.*

(With a Plate.)

In the first year of the present century Ranjít Singh "the Lion of the Panjáb" conquered Lahore. For many years after that event, he was so constantly engaged in subduing the whole of the cities and states of the Panjáb that his name and fame seem to have hidden altogether the name of a better man who bore the name of Ranjít Deo and who ruled in the hill state of Jummú or Jummún as we shall see from coins.

Writing of Jummú, Mr. Frederick Drew in "The Northern Barrier of India"* says: "A century ago the old regime was flourishing under Rája Ranjít Deo; he is still spoken of with the highest respect as a wise administrator, a just judge, and a tolerant man. At that time the direct rule of the Jummú Rája hardly extended so much as twenty miles from the city; but he was lord of a number of feudatory chiefs, of such places as Akhnúr, Dalpatpúr, Kiramchí and Jasrotá, all in the outer Hill tract, chiefs who governed their own subjects, but paid tribute to and did military service for, their liege lord of Jummú.

* Chapter III, pp. 40, 41.